

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

IN RE: NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE
PLAYERS' CONCUSSION INJURY
LITIGATION

No. 2:12-md-02323-AB

MDL No. 2323

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

ALL ACTIONS

Hon. Anita B. Brody

ORDER

AND NOW, this 26th _ day of March, 2018, it is **ORDERED** that RD Legal's Motion (1) to stay the Court's Orders addressing the administration of the Settlement Agreement regarding Third-Party Funders pending its appeal of those Orders or, alternatively, (2) to stay the Orders pending RD Legal's application for a stay to the Third Circuit (ECF No. 9761) is **DENIED**.¹

s/Anita B. Brody

ANITA B. BRODY, J.

¹ RD Legal claims that it is entitled to a stay under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62(d). ECF No. 9761-1, at 1. Rule 62(d) provides for a stay as a matter of right for a money award so long as a supersedeas bond is provided. *See* 11 C. Wright & A. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 2905 (3d ed. 2017). The Rule is inapplicable here because the Orders appealed by RD Legal do not create money awards; instead, the Orders interpret the Settlement Agreement to provide direction to the Claims Administrator in addressing agreements that it determines to be assignments or attempted assignments. No judgment as to whether RD Legal is or is not ultimately entitled to money has been made by the Court. *See* ECF Nos. 9517 & 9749. Therefore, RD Legal's request for a stay fails.

Copies **VIA ECF** on _____ to:

Copies **MAILED** on _____ to: